



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

2. Mr. Reid details the tedious stages of the travail that produced "Villette"—caused, he asserts, by afflictive memories. Yet he transcribes this passage: "I have sometimes desponded and almost despaired because there was no one to whom to read a line, or of whom to ask a counsel. 'Jane Eyre' was not written under such circumstances, nor were two-thirds of 'Shirley.'" Mrs. Gaskell says: "The pen laid down when there were three sisters, alive and loving, was taken up when one alone remained." Charlotte named the chapter that began that last third of "Shirley," "The Valley of the Shadow of Death." Why conjure other shades to haunt it?

3. M. Hégér was Paul Emmanuel. "Lucy Snowe is the truest picture of the real Charlotte Brontë," Charlotte's merry allusions in her letters to "the little man whom none of you like" do not mar the unities of the hypothesis that she loved M. Hégér, returned to Brussels for his sake, was convicted and sent home "suddenly" by his wife, whom Charlotte "paid off" by writing her up as Madame Beck. Why, then, does Mr. Reid brand as "bitter and shameful words when applied to one of the truest and purest of women," and Birrell as "nauseous and malignant hypocrisy," the critique of the *Quarterly Review* upon "Jane Eyre"? "If we ascribe the book to a woman at all, we have no alternative but to ascribe it to one who has, for some sufficient reason, long forfeited the society of her own sex."

This woman, who, thirty-six years ago, laid down for all time the pen that was seldom wielded for self-defence, once wrote a letter to a reviewer who called himself friendly. I copy it entire without comment, *apropos* to the query whether she was in love with M. Hégér:

"To G. H. LEWES, Esq.:

"I can be on my guard against my enemies, but GOD deliver me from friends!—
CURRER BELL."

MARION HARLAND.

II.

LYMAN BEECHER AND INFANT DAMNATION.

I ASK leave to correct a statement of Mr. C. K. Tuckerman concerning my father, Dr. Lyman Beecher, in THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW for January, 1890. It occurs in an account of a sermon which he alleges he heard my father deliver. The statement is that, after describing the horrors of hell, etc., the preacher spoke of a mother who had failed to have her child baptized. The child was killed through the carelessness of a nurse, and my father is represented as saying: "That child, who might have been an angel in heaven, is now, through the negligence of its parents in the matter of baptism, a tenant of hell"; whereupon one man is said to have marched out of the church.

This statement represents my father as believing and teaching (1) that an infant is regenerated and fitted for heaven by baptism; (2) that if not baptized it becomes a tenant of hell. It also represents (3) that apparently but one man dissented from those statements; and (4) that the congregation disapproved of his dissent and sympathized with the preacher.

If Mr. Tuckerman had represented himself as having heard Dr. Channing renounce Unitarianism, and teach orthodoxy to his people with their unanimous applause, it could not be more incredible or contrary to fact than these allegations concerning my father. His position on this question of infant damnation was as well known as that of Dr. Channing on Unitarianism. Soon after his settlement in Boston, in 1826, my father became satisfied that efforts were being extensively made to check the progress of orthodoxy by alleging that its advocates held and taught the damnation of infants. To meet this allegation, he published in 1827 the following statement in a note to his sermon on the government of God:

"I am aware that Calvinists are represented as believing and teaching the monstrous doctrine that infants are damned, and that hell is doubtless paved with their bones. But, having passed the age of fifty, and been conversant for thirty years with the most approved Calvinistic writers, and personally acquainted with many of the most distinguished Calvinistic divines in New England and in the

Middle and Southern and Western States, I must say that I have never seen nor heard of any book which contains such a sentiment, nor a man, minister, nor layman who believed or taught it. And I feel authorized to say that Calvinists, as a body, are as far from teaching the doctrine of infant damnation as any of those who falsely accuse them. And I would earnestly and affectionately recommend to all persons who have been accustomed to propagate the slander that they commit to memory without delay the Ninth Commandment, which is, "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor."

This statement, made early in the second year of his ministry, excited universal attention and emotion. His own congregation were unanimous in their approval of it. It repudiates as a slander the charge that he or any orthodox minister taught the doctrine of infant damnation. Is it not absurd and morally improbable that my father should in a sermon contradict his emphatic public declarations? Is it not absurd to suppose that his people, who unanimously agreed with him in rejecting infant damnation, approved of such a public declaration of it? Is it not absurd to suppose that he contradicted his well-known denial of baptismal regeneration in the case of infants, and taught it on this occasion only as an introduction to the doctrine of infant damnation, which he had always denied and recently publicly denounced in a most emphatic manner as an unmitigated slander?

These erroneous statements have been corrected by some American religious papers. But the circulation of *THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW* is not limited to such papers or to this nation. I ask you, therefore, to correct the errors of Mr. Tuckerman as widely as its circulation of them extends.

EDWARD BEECHER.

THE writer of the article entitled "By-gone Days in Boston," in the January number of *THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW*, has received letters from individuals personally unknown to him with reference to the anecdote he relates of the Rev. Lyman Beecher. One correspondent writes: "The orthodox Congregationalists of that day did not believe in baptismal regeneration or infant damnation. They were as much opposed to these views as they were to Unitarianism." Another writes: "About the neglect of infant baptism is there not a mistake somehow? The Congregationalists, to whom Dr. Lyman Beecher belonged, never attached such importance to the ceremony of infant baptism as that anecdote implies. The Roman Catholics and Episcopalians regard the ceremony as all-important, but it seems to me well-nigh impossible that any orthodox minister could have used such an illustration with such an implication. Moreover, I have the best of reasons for saying that Lyman Beecher believed in the salvation of all infants. I have been intimately acquainted with some of his sons, who have borne most positive testimony to discussions with him and papers read by him on this subject. Is not your memory at fault in this anecdote? Has it not confused Dr. Beecher with some Episcopal or Roman Catholic doctor?"

REPLY: No; but, in consequence of what follows, the writer may have confused what he heard from the pulpit on the occasion referred to with what he heard from others. He listened to discourses from Dr. Lyman Beecher on several occasions when expressions were made use of by that worthy and distinguished clergyman which were generally held to be "extremely injudicious," even by members of his own church. In recording an incident which occurred during the writer's boyhood days, of many years ago, a confusion of place and time—not of the language quoted from the pulpit—is not unlikely. This view is confirmed by the following statement in a letter, just received, from a source entitled to the highest consideration; and it also furnishes a reply to those who maintain that the views of the reverend gentleman were not those which might be inferred from the anecdote in question. This correspondent writes:

"It was my grandfather, Oliver Wolcott,"—an historic personage and Governor of the State of Connecticut,—"who lived a short time in Litchfield, where Mr. Lyman Beecher preached. My impression is that the child baptized was his own, Mr. Beecher's, though that is unlikely; but I have often heard my mother tell the story, and that grandfather never put his foot in that church again. She said the church

door was open, and Governor Wolcott could be seen going down the walk thumping his cane in great indignation."

A lady now eighty years of age adds that this incident has been often told to her, and that it was at the time "in everybody's mouth." This information ought to be conclusive.

May it not be that Mr. Lyman Beecher's extreme theological views on this and kindred subjects became—as was the case with his son, Henry Ward Beecher—materially modified during the later years of his life? If so, this would explain the discrepancy of opinion existing on the subject.

C. K. TUCKERMAN.

III.

CHANGES IN MY BALLOT BILL.

THE measure known as the Ballot-Reform Bill has been approved by both branches of the New York Legislature, and will soon be placed in the hands of the Governor. I am requested by THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW to point out the changes that were made in it during its progress through the Senate and Assembly. This I will endeavor to do as concisely as possible.

It is well to understand clearly at the outset that the bill is the same now, in all essential features, as it was when first introduced. None of the amendments that have been adopted touch any vital principle. The lines of the so-called Australian system have been followed faithfully from first to last. The only changes are as to matters of detail. One great object of those who have had charge of the measure has been to make the meaning of each provision entirely clear; and they have not hesitated to make changes in the forms of expression, whenever by so doing they could the more surely accomplish that purpose. Only three of the Senate amendments are at all important, and those were made at my own suggestion. One of the three deals with the form of the official ballot.

The New York election laws now require the use of several different kinds of ballot. One ballot is indorsed "State," another "County," and still another "Congress," or "Senate," or "Assembly." Sometimes there are as many as eight or nine of these separate tickets for the voter to use, and as many different ballot-boxes for their reception. This provision in our present law was continued in the ballot-reform measures that were passed by the Legislature of 1888 and 1889. Those bills, however, instead of permitting a separate ticket for each set of party candidates, required the names of all candidates nominated for a particular office to be printed upon the same ticket, those of each party grouped together under the proper party name. For example, under that system, if it had been enacted into a law, the names of Republican and Democratic candidates for all State offices would have been printed upon the State ticket in parallel columns, each column headed by the word or words designating the party by which the candidates therein mentioned were placed in nomination. There would have been, besides the State ticket, several others, such as the county ticket, or the congressional ticket, which would be prepared in the same way. The Massachusetts law upon this subject, instead of requiring separate ballots for the different kinds of offices, prescribes the use of one large ballot, sometimes called the "blanket" ballot, which contains the names of candidates for all the various offices to be filled. While engaged in the preparation of the bill now pending, I became thoroughly convinced that the Massachusetts plan is far less intricate and cumbersome than our own. The result was that the bill as introduced prescribed that there should be but two kinds of ballots—one, called the municipal ballot, to contain the names of all candidates for municipal offices, and the other, called the general ballot, to contain the names of candidates for all offices other than municipal. The names of candidates for each office were to be arranged under the designation of the office.

This last provision as to the arrangement of candidates upon the ticket was altered before the bill passed the Senate. It was thought best to revert to the original scheme of grouping candidates together under party names. The idea was thereupon embodied in the following language, which may be found in section 17 of